

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,917	10/16/2003	Eric J. Streciwilk	380-145	7482
1009 KING & SCHI	7590 05/03/200 CKLL PLLC		EXAM	INER
247 NORTH B	ROADWAY		REDDING, DAVID A	
LEXINGTON, KY 40507		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1744	-
		•		
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/686,917	STRECIWILK, ERIC J.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David A. Redding	1744			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [In the state of the	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a red d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 I	February 2007.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Thi	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-21 is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 5-16 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ 	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 October 2003 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	e: a) \square accepted or b) \square of e drawing(s) be held in abeyan ction is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Apority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Preferences Cited (* 13-532) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/28/04; 9/28/06.	Paper No(s)/Mail Date formal Patent Application			

Art Unit: 1744

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-16 in the reply filed on 2/14/07 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USP 6,782,585 ('585).

The '585 patent discloses a housing (assembly of parts 28,60,24,74 (fig.4)), a nozzle inlet (27), a suction generator (described not shown), a dirt collection assembly (28) comprising an outer wall (36), an inner wall (46,50), a bottom wall (38), an inlet (32), an open end (opening between filter (72) housing and element (24)), manifold housing (74), a filter chamber (housing including filter element (72)) and filter element (72). The filter element is considered to be annular. The filter assembly is considered to include a frsutoconical air guide (62). The discharge opening for the air guides is the opening leading to the filter element (72) and the discharge passageway is considered to be proximate the are identified by (40).

Art Unit: 1744

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 6,810,557 (Hansen et al.) in view of USP 5,307,538 (Rench et al.).

Hansen et al. discloses a housing (12), a suction inlet (14), and a dirt collection assembly (550, 560), a suction generator (not shown but described), the dirt collection assembly (550, 560) having an outer wall (144) and an inner wall (570), a bottom wall (582), an inlet (152) and an opening (154), a manifold housing connected to opening (154), a filter chamber with filter element (572). The filter element is annular in shape. The Hansen et al. patent does not show a frustoconical air guide.

The Rench et al. patent discloses a vacuum comprising a frustoconical air guide (21) which by design concentrates the clean air through the filter element (23) and drops out the larger dirt particles into a lower collection chamber (93).

Application/Control Number: 10/686,917

Art Unit: 1744

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the frustoconical air guide of Rench et al. into the dirt collection assembly (550, 560) in Hansen et al. for the known advantages and benefits disclosed in Rench et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the structure defined in claim 5 in combination with the elements of claim 4.

As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant did not provide copies of the foreign (JP) references listed on the PTO-Form #1449. Applicant is requested to provide those copies in order for the references to be properly considered.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A. Redding whose telephone number is 571-272-1276. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 6:00 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran-Piazza can be reached on 571-272-1224. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1744

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Primary Examiner Art Unit 1744

DAR